APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,141	01/03/2002	Radhika Aggarwal	RSW920010112US1 - 7	2419

			EXAMINER
46320	7590	11/28/2006	HUYNH, THU V

CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

NOV 2 8 2006

Technology Center 2100

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/041,141
Filing Date: January 03, 2002
Appellant(s): AGGARWAL ET AL.

Scott D. Paul
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed on 09/11/06 appealing from the Office action mailed 02/24/06.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2003/0105884 A1   UPTON ET AL.   06-2003

6,094,529   JEFFRIES ET AL.   07-2000

6,615,226 B1   HARTMAN ET AL.   09-2003

"Instant HTML", HOMER ET AL., copyright 1997, pages 88-101.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

> (b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Upton</u> et

al., US 2003/0105884 A1, provisional filed 10/2001, in view of <u>Jeffries</u> et al., US 6,094,529,

filed 12/1996 as supplied by the Applicants in IDS filed 01/03/2002, and "Instant HTML",

<u>Homer</u> et al., copyright 1997, pages 88-101.

Regarding independent claim 1, Upton teaches the steps of:

- detecting in a form-based submit, at least one validation error based upon a value

  provided through an input-element in a markup specified form (Upton, col.5,

paragraph 62; user fill-out data and submits an html form, validating data in

submitted form to detect invalid data);

- inserting a row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said

  input element (Upton, col.5, paragraph 62, redisplaying the form with error message

  next to each erroneous field. This inherently disclose inserting a text row next to

  erroneous field in the html form);

- selecting error text corresponding to said validation error and inserting said selected

  error text in said row (Upton, col.5, paragraph 62, redisplaying the form with error

  message next to each erroneous field); and

- serving said markup specified form in a response to said form-based submit (Upton,

  col.5, paragraph 62).

Upton does not explicitly disclose that said row having a background color which differs

from other colors which a visible in proximity to said inserted row; inserting an anchor tag in

said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element; and in a

response to said form-based submit, said response referring said anchor tag.

Jeffries teaches text of error message is highlighted, such as by underlining, changing the

background color to provide a visual indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Jeffries' visual indicator in error message into Upton's

error message in html form to insert error text message having a background color which differs

from other colors which a visible in proximity to said insert error text, since this would have

provided a visual indicator for the user to focus on erroneous field in the html form. It is also

noted that highlighting error data or error text field in an html form as a visual indicator for the

user re-entries the data was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Homer teaches including an anchor within a page so that, when we load the page, that

part of the document is automatically scrolled into view (Homer, page 88, "Anchors Within A

Page" section; placing the anchor tag with name "dalmation" in section Dalmatians to directly

scroll to that section when the page dog.html is loaded).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Homer's teaching into Upton's redisplay form to insert an

anchor tag in the html form in a position which is proximate to said input element, since this

would have allowed when the user submit the html form, error part of the html form is

automatically scrolled into view Homer's disclosed above for the user enter a correct data as.

This would have facilitated the user to re-enter the data when the error field is directly provided.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Upton does not explicitly disclose

inserting an error image adjacent to said input-element.

Jeffries teaches insert a glyph near highlighting text error message to provide a visual

indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Jeffries' glyph visual indicator in error message into

Upton's error message in html form to insert a image/glyph near the error text message, since

this would have provided a visual indicator for the user to focus on erroneous field in the html

form.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4. Refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 1, Upton, Jefferies and Homer teach inserting an anchor tag in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element. Homer also teaches the anchor tag place <u>before</u> the section to be automatically displayed (Homer, page 97, "Using Anchors in Your Pages" section).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Homer's teaching into Upton's redisplay form to insert an anchor tag in the html form in a position which is proximate but before to said input element, since placing the anchor tag before the error section would have allowed the error part of the html form is automatically scrolled into view as Homer's disclosed above for the user enter a correct data as. This would have facilitated the user to re-enter the data when the error field is directly provided.

Claims 6-7 and 10 are for a computer readable medium performing the method of claims 1-2 and 5, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 3-4, 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Upton in view of Jeffries and Homer</u> as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of <u>Hartman</u>, US 6,615,226 B1, filed 09/1997.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Upton, Jefferies and Homer teaches display error message proximate to said input element (error field) as explained above.

However, Upton does not explicitly disclose determining whether said markup specified form

contained multiple views, one of said multiple view containing said input-element and if it is

determined that said markup specified form contains multiple views, identifying said one of said

multiple views and setting said identified one of said multiple views to a visible status

Hartman teaches a markup specified form contained multiple views, one of said multiple

view containing said input-element (error field) (Hartman, col.9, lines 38-59).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Hartman's teaching and Upton to includes the steps of

determining said markup specified form contains multiple views, identifying said one of said

multiple views and setting said identified one of said multiple views to a visible status, since this

would have allowed error message to be displayed proximity to error field in both simple or/and

complex form which contains multiple view to inform error for the user re-entries, since

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Upton, Jefferies and Homer teaches

inserting an error message row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to

said input element, said error message row having a background color which differs from other

colors which are visible in proximity to said inserted row in claim 1 above. Upton does not

explicitly disclose that said position is proximate to but below said input element.

Hartman teaches displaying error message in close proximity but below said input

element (Hartman, col.9, lines 55-59).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Hartman and Upton to provide the error message on many

different position proximate to the error input element to inform the user of error, since below

or/and next is one form of proximate position.

Claims 8-9 are for a computer readable medium performing the method of claims 3-4,

respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

(10) Response to Argument

On pages 4-5 of the Appeal Brief, Appellant argues that "Examiner had not cited to the

provisional application, that burden had not been met" and "Examiner's reference to "pages 8-3

to 8-9" of the '901 provisional application, however, still does not meet the requirement of 37

C.F.R § 1.104(c), which requires that "the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly

as practicable" and "merely citing seven whole pages to disclose multiple claimed elements does

not designate "as nearly as practicable," the particular features within the '901 provisional

application being relied upon by the Examiner in the rejection".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, examiner uses Upton reference (applied

reference) to reject independent claim 1, wherein each limitation in the claim is clearly taught by

Upton as explained and cited by the examiner in the rejection. Second, examiner addressed

particular pages in the '901 provisional application that supports the subject matter relied upon to

make the rejection. Therefore, examiner does not need to cite to the '901 provisional

application. Examiner also notes that '901 provisional application comprises 200 pages and

examiner provides 7 pages over 200 pages to indicate to appellant that the cited portions in

Upton are supported in the '901 provisional. The '901 teaches five steps to processing forms

using Java Servlets and JSPs including: displaying an HTML form for a user fill-out (the '901,

page 8-3). Anytime the user submits the form data, validating the data in submitted form to

detect invalid data (the '901, page 8-3 and page 8-4, "Form Processing Classes", Controller

Servlet validating each value in the request). If any data are invalid, redisplaying the form with

error message next to each erroneous field (the '901, pages 8-3). The '901 teaches "Validator"

in table 8-1 for validating the submitted data (the '901, page 8-5); Tag classes in web application

for generating the HTML for a form filed, displaying a localized error message next to the form

field if the submitted data is invalid as well as (the '901, pages 8-5 and 8-6); and Sequences and

Prerequisites to process the form (the '901, pages 8-7 and 8-9). Therefore, pages 8-3 to 8-8 of

the '901 support the paragraph 62 of the Upton reference and designate "as nearly as

practicable".

From page 6 to page 7 of the Appeal Brief, Appellant argues that "none of these passages

support the Examiner's assertion that the '901 provisional application identically discloses the

claimed "selecting error text corresponding to said validation error and inserting said selected

error text in said row"; the limitation "selecting error text corresponding to said validation error

and inserting said selected error text in said row" is not inherently disclosed by the '901

application; and "one can readily envision a situation in which the text of the error message is

not necessarily selected so as to correspond to the validation error. For example, the text of the

error message can always be "Error", in which situation the text of the error message has not

been selected to correspond to the validation error".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Upton teaches "If any field values are invalid, the form

can be redisplayed to the user with an error message next to each erroneous field on the form"

(Upton, paragraph 62). The '901 teaches "For each value submitted, validate it against a set of

constraints; for example, seeing if age field is a valid integer between 1 and 120" (the '901, page

8-3, step 2); "If any filed values are invalid, the form must be redisplaying to the user with an

error message next to each erroneous field on the form; The error message should be localized

for the user's preferred locale if the web application supports multiple locales" (the '901, page 8-

3, step 3); "If any fields are invalid, the Word object uses a message bundle to retrieve an

internationalized/localized error message for the field" (the '901, page 8-5, "Word and Its

Descendants"). This indicates the error message is not only selected/retrieved corresponding of

the validation but also selected based on locale (language and location related/specific). The

fact that Upton's error messages are displayed next to the erroneous fields inherently and clearly

implies these fields failed to pass their specific validation logics and were identified so as the

error messages can be displayed right next to them. One can therefore clearly conclude that

Upton teaches text of the error message is selected so as to correspond to the validation error and

inserted next to the erroneous field. Moreover, it is noted that the claimed language "selecting

error text corresponding to said validation error ..." does not verify that there are many different

error text messages and how they correspond to validation errors. Therefore, even if the error

text message was always "Error" (as read by Appellant), such text message by Upton's would

still be selected/retrieved corresponding to the validation of the field (the '901, page 8-3, steps 2

and 3, for example age field has invalid value) in the form in order to display such text message

next to erroneous field (age field has invalid value) on the form.

On page 7 of the Appeal Brief, Appellant argues that, "<u>even if</u> one having ordinary skill in the art were motivated to modify the '901 provision[al] application (i.e., Upton) in view of Jeffries and Homer, the claimed invention would not result".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, Upton teaches text of the error message is selected so as to correspond to the validation error. Jeffries teaches text of error message is highlighted, such as by underlining, changing the background color to provide a visual indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33). Therefore, the combination of Upton, Jeffries and Homer would result the claimed invention.

On page 8 of the Appeal Brief, Appellant argues that "[t]he additional reference to Hartmann does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of Upton in view of Jeffries and Homer. Accordingly, the proposed combination of references would not yield the claimed invention".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As explained above, the combination of Upton and Jeffries teaches highlighted error text message is displayed next to the entry field. Hartmann teaches error message is displayed on the line below the entry field (Hartman, col.9, lines 55-60). Therefore, the combination of Upton, Jeffries, Homer and Hartmann would result the claimed invention.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related

Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Thu V. Huynh

Conferees:

Heather Herndon   WEILUN LO
                          SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Steven Hong

                   STEPHEN HONG
         SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER